

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 PROMEDEV, LLC,

CASE NO. C22-1063JLR

11 Plaintiff,

SHOW CAUSE ORDER

12 v.

13 ROBY WILSON, et al.,

14 Defendants.

15 Before the court is Plaintiff Promedev, LLC’s (“Promedev”) complaint. (Compl.
16 (Dkt. # 1).) Having reviewed the complaint, the court finds that Promedev has failed to
17 allege an adequate basis for subject matter jurisdiction. The court therefore orders
18 Promedev to serve and file a submission that includes information sufficient to establish
19 the court’s jurisdiction by August 10, 2022.

20 Promedev asserts that the court’s jurisdiction is based on diversity of citizenship.
21 (Compl. at 2.) For purposes of assessing diversity jurisdiction, the court must consider
22 the domicile of all members of a limited liability company. *Johnson v. Columbia Props.*

1 | *Anchorage, LP*, 437 F.3d 894, 899 (9th Cir. 2006); *see also* Local Rules W.D. Wash.

2 | LCR 8(a) (“If plaintiff is asserting that this court has jurisdiction based on diversity, the

3 | compliant must identify the citizenship of the parties, and, if any of the parties is a limited

4 | liability corporation (LLC) . . . identify the citizenship of the . . . members of those

5 | entities to establish the court’s jurisdiction.”). With respect to Defendants Roby Wilson,

6 | MaXXiMedia Advertising, Co. (“MaXXiMedia”), and Imagipix Corporation

7 | (“Imagipix”) (collectively, “Defendants”), Promedev alleges that: (1) Mr. Wilson “is a

8 | citizen of the State of Texas”; (2) MaXXiMedia “is a corporation incorporated under the

9 | laws of the State of Texas, with its principal place of business in Spring, Texas”; and (3)

10 | Imagipix “is a corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of Texas, with its

11 | principal place of business in Spring, Texas.” (Compl. ¶¶ 2-4.) Promedev further alleges

12 | that it is “a limited liability company incorporated under the laws of the State of

13 | Washington, with its principal place of business in Kirkland, Washington.” (*Id.* ¶ 1.)

14 | Yet, Promedev fails to allege the citizenship of any of its members. (*See generally id.*)

15 | Absent such allegations, the court cannot determine if Promedev has properly invoked

16 | this court’s subject matter jurisdiction on the basis of the parties’ diversity of citizenship.¹

17 |

18 |

19 | _____

20 | ¹ The court notes that if any member of Promedev is itself a limited liability company,

21 | Promedev must provide information about the citizenship of the members of those limited

22 | liability companies as well, which is determined in the same manner described above—namely,

 | by establishing the citizenship of each member. *See Johnson*, 437 F.3d at 899 (examining the

 | citizenship of a limited partnership whose partners included limited liability companies by

 | looking to the citizenship of the members of those limited liability companies). This process

 | continues until every layer of limited liability company membership has been reduced to the

 | citizenship of its individual members.

1 Accordingly, the court ORDERS Promedev to show cause why this case should
2 not be dismissed for lack of federal subject matter jurisdiction. If Promedev fails to
3 provide the court with the information described above by August 10, 2022, the court will
4 dismiss this case.

Dated this 3rd day of August, 2022.



Jim R. Blint

JAMES L. ROBART
United States District Judge